



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

KJ

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/781,577	02/12/2001	Irene E. Kochevar	10284-018001	9723
21874	7590	03/14/2005	EXAMINER	
EDWARDS & ANGELL, LLP P.O. BOX 55874 BOSTON, MA 02205			BARRETT, THOMAS C	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3738	
DATE MAILED: 03/14/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<p style="text-align: center;">Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</p>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/781,577	KOCHEVAR ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit 3738
<p>--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--</p>		
<p>THE REPLY FILED <u>17 November 2004</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.</p>		
<p>1. <input type="checkbox"/> The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:</p>		
<p>a) <input type="checkbox"/> The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.</p>		
<p>b) <input type="checkbox"/> The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.</p>		
<p>Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).</p>		
<p>Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).</p>		
<p>NOTICE OF APPEAL</p>		
<p>2. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The reply was filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing an appeal brief. The Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>17 November 2004</u>. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).</p>		
<p>AMENDMENTS</p>		
<p>3. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because</p>		
<p>(a) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);</p>		
<p>(b) <input type="checkbox"/> They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);</p>		
<p>(c) <input type="checkbox"/> They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or</p>		
<p>(d) <input type="checkbox"/> They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.</p>		
<p>NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u>. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).</p>		
<p>4. <input type="checkbox"/> The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).</p>		
<p>5. <input type="checkbox"/> Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.</p>		
<p>6. <input type="checkbox"/> Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).</p>		
<p>7. <input type="checkbox"/> For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) <input type="checkbox"/> will not be entered, or b) <input type="checkbox"/> will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.</p>		
<p>The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:</p>		
<p>Claim(s) allowed: _____.</p>		
<p>Claim(s) objected to: _____.</p>		
<p>Claim(s) rejected: _____.</p>		
<p>Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.</p>		
<p>AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE</p>		
<p>8. <input type="checkbox"/> The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</p>		
<p>9. <input type="checkbox"/> The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).</p>		
<p>10. <input type="checkbox"/> The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.</p>		
<p>REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</p>		
<p>11. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u>.</p>		
<p>12. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.</p>		
<p>13. <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.</p>		
 Thomas C. Barrett Examiner Art Unit: 3738		

Continuation of 3. NOTE: the limitation "without producing substantial thermal damage" requires further consideration.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The Applicant argues "In the Khadem Declaration, an exogenous protein substrate concentration of at least 1% is described as a critical ingredient of photoactivable compositions for use in tissue bonding. Thus, as stated by Dr. Hamblin and as supported by the documentary evidence provided herein, the description in Column 7 lines 18-30 and Table 2 of Khadem lack enablement for the claimed methods and the remaining disclosure in Khadem does not fill the gap." However, as noted in the prior action "The declaration states, "it is my opinion, as one of ordinary skill in the art, who has read the Khadem patent, that portions of the patent other than column 7 lines 18-30 cannot be relied upon for additional instruction because they are solely intended for methods that require application of an exogenous substrate". Therefore the declaration admits the "four sentences" are directed to methods that do not require application of exogenous substrates." and therefore the prior art is enabled. Furthermore, regarding the Khadem declaration, column 7 lines 18-30 of the prior cited Khadem reference also discloses "Such methods utilize the peptides or proteins located naturally within the tissue area as in situ protein containing compositions." Contrary to the Applicant's argument Khadem never declares the protein used to be exogenous protein as defined in the present application. Therefore the Khadem declaration does not show the Khadem patent to lack enablement.